Application/Control Number: 09/314,637   113607
Art Unit: 2654

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are requested. The Examiner indicated in the

Advisory Action that the Response filed on April 20, 2005 was considered fully. Therefore,

claims 13 - 36 are pending as amended in the April 20, 2005 Response.

Rejection of Claim 28 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejects claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by

Alleva et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,970,449 ("Alleva"). Applicants have cancelled claim 28

without prejudice or disclaimer and moved its limitations into claim 29. Dependent claims

have been amended accordingly. Therefore, Applicants submit that the rejection of this claim

is moot.

Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejects the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Alleva in view of Sukkar, U.S. Patent No. 5,613,037 ("Sukkar"). Applicants respectfully

traverse this rejection and provide further arguments regarding why Alleva should not be

combined with Sukkar.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner again asserts that the "implementation of

acoustic models representative of input speech to be recognized for implementation in a

speech recognition system was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art of speech signal

processing to achieve improved accuracy." As stated in our previous response, section

2143.01 of the MPEP clearly states that the obviousness standard requires more than this:

> A statement that modifications of the prior art to meet the claimed invention would
> have been " 'well within the ordinary skill of the art at the time the claimed invention
> was made' " because the references relied upon teach that all aspects of the claimed
> invention were individually known in the art is not sufficient to establish a *prima facie*
> case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine the teachings of the
> references. *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 USPQ2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). See

2

Application/Control Number: 09/314,637   113607
Art Unit: 2654

also *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2000).
(emphasis in original)

The MPEP even highlights this principle. The Examiner's reason for combining the

teachings of the references is merely to "improve" the vector representations of received

input speech signals and thereby improve speech recognition accuracy. The Examiner even

states that implementing the digit/filler/generalized HMM models of Sukkar would improve

the vector representations of the received input speech digits. The Examiner previously

argued that Sukkar's teachings would "provide" the "accurately" producing vector

representations. Applicant identified in the April 20, 2005 Response that the Alleval Speech

Recognition already uses vector representations and in the Advisory Action the Examiner

now asserts that the Sukkar models would "improve" the vector representations.

As previously cited, just because reference <u>can</u> be combined does not get one over

the hurdle of identifying a supportable motivation or suggestion to combine references. Here,

Alleva focuses on the text normalization process and identify a suitable speech recognizer.

Alleva makes no mention of any need for improved recognition accuracy. Therefore,

Applicant maintains that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine these two

references.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed the rejection of claims 13 - 36, Applicants respectfully submit that

the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly

solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 23, 2005   by: /Thomas M. Isaacson/

Correspondence Address: Thomas M. Isaacson
Samuel H. Dworetsky   Attorney for Applicants
AT&T Corp.   Reg. No. 44,166
Room 2A-207   Phone: 410-414-3056
One AT&T Way   Fax No.: 410-510-1433
Bedminster, NJ 07921

3